



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,414	10/23/2003	William Kress Bodin	AUS920030248US1	8489
34533	7590	05/29/2007	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF) c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP P.O. BOX 1469 AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469			TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2141		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,414	BODIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R. Taylor	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 have been examined and are rejected.

Double Patenting

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected on the ground of statutory double patenting based on the allowed claims in application 10/607,486, now U.S. Patent 7,151,969. The claims in the instant application are a subset of the allowed claims (i.e., determining user metrics, creating a user metric space, determining based on the metric space whether to allow an action from a dynamically created list).

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states, "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor" (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 2141

3. Claims 1-18 are also rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of applications 10/418,596, 10/481,612, 10/418,689, 10/455,714, 10/455,176, 10/607,461, 10/651,724 (where the metric vector is represented by "pattern"), and 10/637,019. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they claim obvious variants of creating a user metric vector comprising a plurality of disparate metrics for a user, selecting a predefined condition space for the user in dependence upon the user metric vector, identifying an action in dependence upon the selected predefined condition space, and executing the action.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ting (U.S. PGPub 2002/0174348).

6. Ting teaches a method for administering devices in a network, the method comprising:

creating a user metric vector comprising a plurality of disparate user metrics;
(Ting, paragraphs 0032-0033)

creating a user metric space comprising a plurality of metric ranges; (Ting,
paragraphs 0033 and 0035)

determining whether the user metric vector is outside the user metric space;
(Ting, paragraphs 0031-0035, 0042-0043, and 0046-0047)

if the user metric vector is outside a user metric space, (Ting, paragraphs 0042-
0043, 0046-0047), and identifying an action in dependence upon the user metric vector;
determining whether the action is allowed; and if the action is allowed, executing the
action (Ting, paragraph 0050 and fig. 1, where an action list is provided with available
actions such as those described in paragraph 0049).

7. As per claims 2, 8, and 14, Ting teaches the system further wherein determining
whether the action is allowed comprises comparing the identified action with an allowed
action list (Ting, paragraph 0050).

8. As per claims 3, 9, and 15, Ting teaches the system further comprising
identifying an allowed replacement action, if the identified action is not allowed (Ting,
paragraphs 0048-0051).

9. As per claims 4, 10, and 16, Ting teaches the system further wherein identifying an allowed replacement action comprises comparing the identified action with an allowed action list (Ting, paragraphs 0048-0051).

10. As per claims 5, 11, and 17, Ting teaches the system further comprising executing the allowed replacement action (Ting, paragraphs 0048-0051).

11. As per claims 6, 12, and 18, Ting teaches the system further comprising receiving an allowed action list (Ting, paragraph 0050 and fig. 1, where an action list is provided).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This includes:

U.S. Patent No. 5,544,651, which describes a method of invoking services and actions based on user metrics;

U.S. PGPub 2002/0174346, which describes a method of biometric authentication with additional security enhancements; and

U.S. PGPub 2004/0187029, which describes a method of filtering actions based on user data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2141

3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141



RUPAL DHARIA
IPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER